1 Court Reporter: Gene Rudolph 2 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn. New York 3 (718) 613-2538 4 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 5 6 7 8 9 10 THE CLERK: United States against Romanello and 11 Santora. 12 Please state your appearances for the record. 13 MR. DENNEHY: For the government, Jack Dennehy and 14 Amir Toossi. 15 Good morning, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Good morning. 17 MR. MARI: For Anthony Romanello, Mathew Mari, 18 MARI. 19 Good morning, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Good morning. 21 MR. REHBOCK: For Nicholas Santora, 22 Richard A. Rehbock. 23 Good morning, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Good morning. 25 I understand that there has been a superceding

indictment, that Mr. Romanello was added and has already been 1 2 arraigned. Is that correct? 3 MR. MARI: Yes, that is correct, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Santora has not been arraigned on the superceding indictment, is that correct? 5 6 MR. REHBOCK: That is correct, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Rehbock, have you been over the 8 superceding indictment with your client? 9 MR. REHBOCK: Yes. I discussed it with him, yes. 10 THE COURT: Does he waive a formal and public 11 reading? 12 MR. REHBOCK: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: How does he plead? 14 MR. REHBOCK: Not guilty. THE COURT: Okay. We have a trial date and a jury 15 16 selection, Mr. Dennehy. 17 MR. DENNEHY: Yes, Your Honor. 18 Your Honor, this case, as you well know, was set 19 down for trial. Five of the six defendants in the original 20 indictment have entered pleas. Mr. Santora indicated that he 21 did not wish to avail himself of a plea offer. 22 In focusing then on the evidence that the government 23 is in possession of as to Mr. Santora, there is 24 evidence -- a cooperating witness that had been working with 25 the FBI had made numerous recordings which are the subject of

the superseding indictment charges as to Mr. Santora and Mr. Romanello. Due to security concerns and logistics about the efficacy of that cooperating witness remaining proactive, decisions were made with the FBI and last week that cooperating witness was relocated for his own security. His information was presented to a grand jury and this superseding indictment was returned.

THE COURT: This has new discovery then?

MR. DENNEHY: It does, Your Honor.

This particular individual made in excess of 70 recordings during the course of his time cooperating with the government.

THE COURT: The reason we decided not to bring this to the Court and the defendant's attention sooner was what?

MR. DENNEHY: Mr. Santora indicated that he wished not to avail himself of a plea and to go to trial. That person's information was looked into. The decision was made either to seek a protective order from the Court not to disclose it and protect that informant's identity, or to pull that informant from the street, relocate him and use his information proactively.

THE COURT: Would this information have to be turned over? I take it, would have had to have been turned over if Mr. Santora was going to trial on Monday on the original indictment, correct?

MR. DENNEHY: Or in the alternative, if the Court had signed a protective order based on the fact that the witness was still being used proactively and that his safety could be compromised were those materials disclosed.

THE COURT: Shouldn't that protective order have come sometime ago, Mr. Dennehy, at the beginning of this case? Discovery was turned over earlier.

MR. DENNEHY: That is correct.

When I was assigned to this case, Your Honor, and it was decided that the only defendant still going to trial was Mr. Santora, I investigated the evidence in the government's possession regarding Mr. Santora and decided whether or not to seek either a protective order or to use his information.

Consultation was had with the FBI and the decision to use his information was made.

THE COURT: My only point is --

MR. DENNEHY: I understand the Court's point.

THE COURT: -- that it's all one government and presumably the other earlier Assistants should have known about this. This is because it creates scheduling issues --

MR. DENNEHY: I certainly understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and other issues.

MR. DENNEHY: The fact of the matter --

THE COURT: I understand from your letter this morning that Mr. Romanello has also pled guilty in another

case before Judge Glasser? 1 2 MR. DENNEHY: Yes, Your Honor. 3 I did file this letter on ECF. I have handed up a 4 copy to the Court and also to defense counsel and I will provide a copy to Judge Glasser's chambers as well. 5 6 Mr. Romanello in the case before Judge Glasser had 7 pleaded guilty to charges involving RICO conspiracy. He is 8 due to be sentenced on May 18th before Judge Glasser. 9 THE COURT: And a plea agreement? 10 MR. DENNEHY: Via a plea agreement which in fact was 11 a 11(c)(1)(b) type plea agreement. 12 THE COURT: It didn't cover this? 13 MR. DENNEHY: No. Your Honor. 14 In that case I can state that there was a protective order signed regarding this particular individual's 15 16 information in the Romanello case before Judge Glasser. 17 MR. MARI: Judge, that matter will be disputed on 18 paper, motion will be made to dismiss these current charges 19 based upon the plea agreement in Judge Glasser's case. 20 Just -- if Your Honor wishes to hear from me now? Shall I 21 wait? 22 I take it, you've -- that is a THE COURT: No. 23 motion you intend to make though. MR. MARI: Absolutely, Judge. The first order of 24

25

business is to do that.

I can tell the Court that Mr. Dennehy was the lead counsel in that case in front of Judge Glasser, which was going on for a year and a half. It was a very contentious case. On the eve of trial we agreed to a plea which would expose Mr. Romanello to ten to 16 months in jail and that -- I may say to the Court, those charges were charges that went back to 1999 and we were about to go to trial on that.

The government continually was adding ancient charges, nothing new, nothing recent, nothing within the last five years, and we made an agreement and we thought that everything was covered and that Mr. Romanello was finished and we pled to the RICO conspiracy, the Genovese enterprise, to cover -- it was an extortion case too there, and we may be wrong and they may be right, but I spoke to Mr. McMahon yesterday. Mr. McMahon and I are on trial in front of Judge Forest in the Southern District of New York at this very moment and I just left here to appear today. But that's the first order of business.

Certainly, we need to get discovery on this case and we need to make motions, including perhaps suppressing the tapes. Possibly we may make a motion to sever Mr. Romanello from this case. I think if that happens, everything will go smoothly.

I can honestly say to you, we don't know what these charges are about. But if there is any kind of proof, if the

government could convince us that they have a substantial case, our probable course of action after we make all our motions, get some discovery and find out what this is about, it's not out of the question for us to hope that we might get this back before Judge Glasser and put everything together and see what we could do to resolve this thing instead of facing another trial.

We prepared for trial in Mr. Romanello's case for a year and a half and I could tell Your Honor that more work went in that case than any other case I've been in that has not gone to trial.

We resolved it. We resolved it amicably. The government was satisfied, Mr. Romanello was satisfied, Judge Glasser was satisfied. And now I don't mean to use this word in a pejorative sense, we kind of have been broadsided by this, another old case where the conduct alleges from 2008 and we wonder after all we had been through in Mr. Romanello's case in front of Judge Glasser why wasn't that brought up? They brought up things that were so farfetched and so far away from the original indictment that even Judge Glasser commented on it. He said that the new charges were a totally new indictment that were being brought in to prove the enterprise.

I am hoping -- I don't know why this happened. But I am hoping that we can get together with the government and resolve this. But certainly we don't need to be brought into

a situation, which is a trial ready situation with regard to the codefendant.

THE COURT: Mr. Rehbock, we have a trial with the selection of a jury on Monday and trial to follow the next week. What is your position?

MR. REHBOCK: I am hesitant to involve Your Honor with plea negotiations, but we have tried to resolve this. I don't want to get into the problem of timing is -- I suspect. But with these new charges, I don't think that we can go to trial next week or the 7th and the 14th, because they are brand new charges. I know nothing about them. My client knew nothing about them until this morning.

THE COURT: There are 70 recordings, is that what you said?

MR. DENNEHY: That witness made in excess of 70 recordings. They all be provided to the defense, Your Honor. We have isolated the relevant recordings as to these charges. Clearly, they are entitled to all of his recordings for informational purposes, Giglio purposes.

THE COURT: How did you think that Mr. Rehbock and his client were going to be ready for jury selection on Monday and trial a week from then in light of this?

MR. DENNEHY: Your Honor, as I stated, this decision was made last week to take this cooperating witness off the street and move him for his security. He has viable valid

this indictment against both of these defendants. The crime is within the Statute of Limitations. It's something that the government would be derelict if it was not charged, if we had the information in our possession. It is not done for scheduling or any other purpose. It is a viable valid charge returned by the grand jury.

THE COURT: I know. It is just that I have problems, Mr. Dennehy, and this isn't the first time, with the government beginning to focus at what one might call the eleventh hour on a case. It is disruptive. It is not the first time that the government does this.

MR. DENNEHY: In this particular case, Your Honor, this informant was proactively working with the FBI up until last month. It is not a case of looking under the rocks for old evidence. This was an active, proactive investigation that decisions were made about when best to take it down and to relocate him and that was done here.

THE COURT: That doesn't explain why the government didn't come for a protective order though, does it?

MR. DENNEHY: No, it does not.

THE COURT: Mr. Dennehy, what do you think that the Court should do here? You give me your idea of how we proceed.

MR. DENNEHY: We have sent these relevant

recordings, Your Honor, to a transcription service, to make 1 2 draft transcripts of them. I am going to provide them all to 3 defense counsel this week. I don't want speak for defense counsel. Mr. Mari has indicated an intention to possibly resolve this case. I don't know what Mr. Santora's position 5 6 is with a possible chance to resolve it for plea negotiations. 7 But I will provide this discovery to the defense 8 expeditiously. We will focus it and narrow it down to the 9 extent we can for them but, obviously, as Mr. Rehbock states, 10 they are going to need to review it and digest it and 11 decide --

THE COURT: When is it going to be available?

MR. DENNEHY: The recordings are being copied as we speak, Your Honor. The relevant ones will be turned over today. The totality of them will be turned over this week or made available at a duplication company and as soon as we have transcripts of the relevant pieces of recordings that are relevant to the crime in the superseding indictment, we will turn those over as well.

MR. REHBOCK: The only comment I have to make is turned over to a development company for us to purchase.

Mr. Santora has no money whatsoever, Judge, none. And he was previously CJA. I was brought in to the case.

THE COURT: You are not CJA.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. REHBOCK: No, no. Mr. Hochbaum was. I came

into --

THE COURT: He retained a lawyer?

MR. REHBOCK: Yes. But I am going to state to Your Honor, he has absolutely no money and that if the government wants to make this available to us, I ask that you -- that you enter an order that he may get them free of charge. He has qualified otherwise and, quite frankly, I have -- I am reluctant to go on the record. But I haven't been paid anything, Judge. That is not a bar to me actively pursuing this case, like I would if it was otherwise. I am just talking about the financial situation of this man. I would never use it as an excuse of shirking my duties because I didn't get paid.

I didn't want to bring out this whole thing, but it is the whole thing about are we going to get hung up further not receiving these copies from this company that does the duplication because we have to pay them. That will cause us a further problem.

I ask that he be permitted these copies free of charge.

THE COURT: Who he is going to pay for them, the government? Are you asking the government to -- can you make a copy of them and give them to the defendant under these circumstances?

MR. DENNEHY: Certainly, Your Honor.

As to these 15 or 18 of the relevant recordings, we 1 2 are coping those in-house, as I said, as we speak. They will 3 be turned over today. The bulk of them, which would 4 constitute the witness' otherwise Rule 16 and Giglio materials, I will do what the Court directs. As I say, it 5 6 will be the government I guess paying for it then. 7 THE COURT: Why doesn't the government provide all 8 of it at this point in time at its expense, just because of 9 the delay that it has caused. I would ask the government to do that. 10 11 THE CLERK: I'm sorry. Is there a date by which --12 THE COURT: You said Friday, right? 13 MR. DENNEHY: They will be available at the end of 14 the week, yes. 15 THE CLERK: All of the recordings? 16 THE COURT: All of the recordings? 17 MR. DENNEHY: All of the recordings, yes. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Mari, you have suggested that before 19 motions are due that you are going to discuss the matter with 20 the government. 21 Mr. Rehbock, are you still discussing a disposition 22 with the government on behalf of your client? 23 MR. REHBOCK: Judge, I sent them --24 THE COURT: No. I am just asking, are you going to 25 continue that?

```
1
              MR. REHBOCK: The answer is yes.
 2
              We were ready to move forward on that.
 3
              THE COURT: Why don't we do this. Why don't I put
 4
    this over for a status conference before we get into dealing
    with motions and setting a trial date on the hopes that we
5
    will have further discussions.
 6
7
              Does that make sense?
8
              MR. MARI: Yes.
9
              MR. REHBOCK: Yes, Your Honor.
10
              MR. DENNEHY:
                            Yes.
11
              THE COURT: Mr. Dennehy?
12
              MR. DENNEHY: Yes.
13
              THE COURT: You agree with that?
14
              MR. DENNEHY: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: May we have a date about two weeks from
16
    now?
17
              MR. MARI: Judge, we are on trial, Mr. McMahon and
18
    I, and we get Fridays off.
19
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. MARI: I am anticipating we should be concluded
20
21
    by the 14th, at the latest. Mr. Romanello has to appear in
22
    front of Judge Glasser at 11:00 am on the 18th. Would it be
23
    inappropriate to put this case on for that same day?
24
              THE COURT:
                          If I have the time.
25
              MR. REHBOCK: If it's the afternoon, Judge. I have
```

```
to be before Judge Wexler. The one day I have on my calendar,
1
 2
    I have to be before Judge Wexler at 11:00 o'clock out in
 3
    Central Islip.
 4
              THE COURT: We can put it on at 3:00 o'clock.
              MR. MARI:
                         That would be fine.
 5
                          3:00 on the 18th.
              THE COURT:
 6
7
              MR. REHBOCK: That should be enough time for me.
8
              THE COURT: I will exclude time on Mr. Romanello,
9
    continue to exclude time for Mr. Santora, ongoing plea
10
    negotiations.
11
              MR. REHBOCK: No objection whatsoever.
12
              MR. MARI: Consent, Your Honor, yes.
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
14
              MR. REHBOCK: I just -- we have three dates.
              THE COURT: You don't have to come -- the fourth is
15
16
          The jury selection is off.
    off.
17
              You are not seeking to go forward? You want the
18
    time?
19
              MR. REHBOCK: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: Correct, Mr. Rehbock?
              MR. REHBOCK: Yes. I just want, so the record
21
22
    somehow finds its way clear, that we do not have to appear the
23
    fourth, seventh or fourteenth.
24
              THE COURT:
                          No. From what I am gathering, you are
25
    not insisting, you don't want to go to trial on --
```

```
1
              MR. REHBOCK: Not this.
 2
              THE COURT: -- on the underlying charges?
 3
              MR. REHBOCK: Not next week, yes, ma'am, that's for
 4
    sure.
              THE COURT: Okay.
5
              MR. REHBOCK: I'm sorry to belabor. I just wanted
 6
7
    to make the record clear, that we don't have to appear.
8
              THE COURT: I understand that.
                                              That's fine.
              MR. MARI: 3:00 pm, May 18th.
9
              THE COURT: Yes. I will see everyone then.
10
11
              MR. MARI: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
12
              MR. REHBOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
              (Matter concludes.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```